

## **REMARKS**

The Office Action mailed March 1, 2005 rejected claim 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 101;<sup>1</sup> objected to claims 4-14 and 22-44 under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c); rejected claims 45-46 under U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph;<sup>2</sup> and rejected claims 1-3, 15-18, and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Nochur et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,835,758 (November 10, 1998) (Nochur).

By this Amendment, Applicants have cancelled claims 1-46 and added new claims 47-81. No new matter has been added.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 101. By this reply, claim 44 has been cancelled rendering the Section 101 rejection of this claim moot.

Regarding the objection to claims 4-14 and 22-44 under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c), Applicants have cancelled claims 4-14 and 22-44 thereby rendering this objection moot. Newly added claims comply with the provisions of 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 45-46 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. By this reply, claims 45-46 have been cancelled, thereby rendering the Section 112, second paragraph rejection of claims 45-46 moot. Newly added claims comply with the provisions of Section 112, second paragraph.

---

<sup>1</sup> Applicants note that although the body of the Office Action indicates a rejection of claim 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and an objection to claim 44 under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c), the Office Action Summary indicates only an objection to claim 44. Applicants treat this as a typographical error and therefore address the rejection of claim 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 in addition to the objection under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c).

<sup>2</sup> Applicants note that although the body of the Office Action indicates only a rejection of claims 45-46 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph, the Office Action Summary indicates only an objection to claims 45-46. Applicants treat this as a typographical error and therefore address the rejection of claims 45-46 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-3, 15-18, and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a). By this reply, claims 1-3, 15-18, and 19-21 have been cancelled, rendering the Section 102(a) rejection of these claims moot.

Applicants respectfully submit that newly added claims are in a condition for allowance for at least the reason that Nochur does not teach or suggest every claim element. For example, independent claim 47 recites a series of method steps including, among other things, “generating consistency link data identifying locations of identified items of data within said electronic documents based upon said determination of whether said identified items of data at said locations fulfill the relationships defined by the consistency rules utilized to identify said items of data.” Nochur does not teach or suggest at least this claim element.

For at least the reasons set forth above, independent claims 47-81 should be allowable. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of claims 47-81.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action contains numerous assertions concerning the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether those assertions are addressed specifically herein, Applicants respectfully decline to automatically subscribe to them.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge  
any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

By:

Jeffrey A. Berkowitz  
Reg. No. 36,743

Dated: August 29, 2005